

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,149 issued to Jammes, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,416 issued to Gregg, et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,480 issued to Donohue, et al. The rejection asserts that Jammes and Gregg allegedly teach each element of the claims except for reformatting of requested information based on the information regarding the user's remote access device, which is allegedly taught by Donohue.

The claims are amended herein to further clarify the present invention. The claims as amended are directed toward remotely accessing subscriber information from an enterprise network in real-time in which a rendering module interacts with a screen bank containing screen data, wherein the rendering module uses the screen data to reformat said data for said remote access device based on both the type of browser and the type of device. The screen bank is shown in Figure 5, item 506 and described in the specification in paragraphs 0074 and 0075. As described in the specification, the screen bank contains screen data including templates (paragraph 0075) which the rendering module can then use to format the data based on the type of browser. The screen bank allows formatting of device specific information in a simple and quick manner. Further, in paragraph 0081, the specification describes how the type of device is identified using browser header information. After this information is obtained, the system then interfaces with the input device with input device specific limitation, e.g. screen size limitations, colors/greyscale data, and so forth. Thus, the present invention teaches using both the type of browser and the type of device to select the template and format the information for the remote access device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the use of a screen bank with screen data or templates based on both the type of browser and the type of device. Jammes and Gregg only

discuss modifying the information into browser specific formats using information such as type of browser or operating system. Donohue teaches using templates to account for browser specific information. While Donohue teaches using browser information, there is no teaching or suggestion in Donohue of using both browser information and device information. Just using browser information is not equivalent to the present claims. For example, a plurality of different devices, each with differing capabilities, may all run the same browser. If the claims were interpreted using browser specific information, the data will not be modified in the most efficient format for each device. One device running browser A may be fully capable of running video clips and have a certain screen size, while a second device running the same browser A is unable to run the video clips and has a different screen size. Without using the type of device in addition to the browser information, the server would not know whether to send a video clip as part of the screen data or what size screen to format. Donohue never teaches or suggests looking to the capabilities of the device in addition to the browser information to determine and format the screen data. Only the present claims take into account the plurality of devices all having differing capabilities. When the claims are read as written, the cited art does not teach or suggest the limitations of the claims.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 10, and 17 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 10, and 17.

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 17, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21 are likewise in condition for

allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-16, and 18-21.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated February 11, 2007

By: /James T. Hagler/
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502